EXHIBIT 22

Page 229

MR. BANKS: Could you read the question back for me, Peggy? Thank you.
(Designated question is read.)
THE WITNESS: It will tend to reduce it, but once again, there is that interaction so that it doesn't completely eliminate it.
BY MR. BANKS:
Q. Do you consider yourself to be an expert in statistics?
A. I consider myself to be a competent methodologist.
Q. Have you ever taught a course in statistics?
A. I taught an undergraduate course at Barnard College in quantitative methods.
Q. When?
A. In 1999 or 2000.
Q. Is that the last time you've taught a course in statistics?
A. That's the last time that I taught statistics.
Q. Have you ever published on the area of quantitative methods? I don't mean have you used statistics in your work.
A. Right.
Q. Have you published any articles or books or treatises on --

Page 230

A. On methods themselves?
Q. -- on quantitative methods?
A. No, I have not. I have used quantitative methods, but I have not published methodological articles.
Q. Have you ever given testimony in any matter as an expert in statistics or quantitative methods?
A. No.
Q. Do you consider yourself capable of providing expert opinions on the use of one quantitative method versus a different quantitative method?
A. It would depend on what methods you were talking about. So there are some methods that I'm sufficiently well-versed in that I could do that, but I would not have the diversity of some of my colleagues who consider themselves methodologists.
Q. Would you consider yourself to have the diversity and experience of, say, Killingsworth to testify about quantitative methods?
A. I don't know enough about his specific qualifications to -- I would say probably not, but I don't know enough about his specific qualifications.
Q. How about Bloom?
A. I would say the same thing.
Q. Are you familiar with the statistical phrase "small sample"?

Page 231

A. Yes.
Q. What do you understand that to mean?
A. Small sample is often -- we often define anything less than 30 as a small sample or sometimes as a small cell size. Typically anything less than ten is considered a small cell size and what that means is that a lot of the time, sample statistics are not normally distributed in small sample. So you can't assume that the error terms are normally distributed. Do you know what a normal distribution is?
Q. Yes.
A. So in a small sample, you don't have a normal distribution and so it means that you can't develop good estimates of things like standard deviation.
Q. Are there different methods of testing small samples for statistical significance as opposed to large samples?
A. Yes. There -- well, there can be, but the simple fact of small samples often means that they're not as accurate.
Q. What kinds of quantitative methods are used for testing statistical significance in small samples as opposed to large samples?
A. I think the one that's most often used is Fisher's exact test.

Page 232

Q. Have you used the Fisher's exact test?
A. Well, what I would say is that my statistical analysis package will spit it out if cell size is below ten. Do I use it? I think the answer to that is no. I think that one of the things you watch out for is trying to, you know, be careful about making any inferences in cases where you have too few observations.
Q. Have you ever written an article or publication or expert report in which you have used a Fisher's exact test to measure for statistical significance?
A. No.
Q. Is a Fisher's exact test an appropriate method of comparing male to female layoff rates or reduction in force rates if you're dealing with a small sample size?
A. I would not view a Fisher's exact test as very reliable because the sample size is so small.
Q. In this case, are we dealing with a small sample size or a large sample size?
A. Are we talking about the fourth RIF?
Q. Yes.
A. If you look at the Public Finance Department as a whole, 159 cases, I would say that's still relatively small, but it's large enough to find statistically significant effect if the effect itself is, you know, substantial in magnitude.